

Message

From: Casso, Ruben [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=E33DF0ABBBF049959E9100E556C7E634-CASSO, RUBEN]
Sent: 8/6/2021 12:53:31 PM
To: Toups, Brad [Toups.Brad@epa.gov]
CC: Verhalen, Frances [verhalen.frances@epa.gov]; Hood, Brianna [Hood.Brianna@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: R6 Updated Risk Population Tables
Attachments: Eastman Chemical Updated Risk Population Table.docx; Union Carbide Updated Risk Population Table.docx

Brad – OAQPS sent us two tables they had to revise in the risk assessment report. (See email from Mike Moeller below) See Jeff's email below on his thoughts posting the corrected tables.

Please advise Fran & I on the best way to you see for us to proceed.

Thanks.

-Ruben

From: Robinson, Jeffrey Robinson.Jeffrey@epa.gov
Sent: Thursday, August 5, 2021 4:29 PM
To: Casso, Ruben Casso.Ruben@epa.gov; Verhalen, Frances verhalen.frances@epa.gov
Cc: Mohr, Ashley Mohr.Ashley@epa.gov
Subject: RE: R6 Updated Risk Population Tables

Regarding your question below, since the report has been posted online, I'm okay with posting the tables as revised or updated tables? Feel free to work with Brad to decide if new wording needed for Regional website and/or if they're any implications on 508 compliance from a website accessibility/translation perspective in just adding the revised tables.

From: Moeller, Michael <moeller.michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 5, 2021 3:13 PM
To: Casso, Ruben <Casso.Ruben@epa.gov>
Cc: Mohr, Ashley <Mohr.Ashley@epa.gov>
Subject: R6 Updated Risk Population Tables

Hi Ruben and Ashley,

As I discussed on the call with Eastman, we did discover a bug within a previous version of the HEM demographic calculation that affects the results for the risk population tables in the original risk report. Specifically, this affected Eastman as well as Union Carbide. The tables from these two facilities were only displaying population within 3km instead of the intended 50km as the others.

I've attached updated tables for Eastman and Union Carbide that now correctly displays the population for the full modeling domain (50km). Would you like me to also submit a revised risk assessment report? Or are these individual updated tables sufficient?

I apologize for the confusion, and let me know if there are any additional questions.

Thanks,

-Mike